DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 024 970 CG 003 030

By- Mock, Kathleen R.
The Potential Activist and his Perception of the University.
American Psychological Association, Washington, D.C.
Pub Date 2 Sep 68
Note- 21p.; Speech presented at American Psychological Association Convention, San Francisco, California, August 30 through September 3, 1968.
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.15
Descriptors- Attitude Tests, *College Students, *Political Attitudes, Self Concept, *Social Values, *Student Alienation

In a freshman survey at three University of California campuses, it was noted that freshmen who responded most favorabley on an attitude question concerning a well-publicized activist movement, the Berkely Free Speech Movement (FSM), were much like the demonstrators themselves when compared on a wide range of psychological scales. On issues closely tied to campus life, those reacting favorably to the FSM exceeded their peers in sympathy for the promotion of faculty on the basis of teaching, opposition to loyalty oaths, and greater student involvement in university policy. Personality test data concerning independence of judgment suggest that the potential activists had already attained a way of thinking which reflected freedom and emancipation. Environmentally, the potential activists prefer a situation where they set their own tasks and work independently, and where they have informal access to the staff. Their counterparts prefer traditional classroom organization. The survey conclusion suggests that the student activist is here to stay. It behooves those academicians who will be working with them to learn as much as possible about them so that they can help make the college years fruitful for all concerned. (CJ)

The Potential Activist and His Perception of the University[1]

Kathleen Ranieet Mock[2]
University of California, Berkeley
Center for Research and Development in Higher Education

In psychology and higher education today, student activism is a topic of increasing interest: the psychologists, remembering the apathy of the fifties, are intrigued with the personality dynamics; those in higher education want to know what it all means in terms of making education relevant to this generation. It was only natural, then, that as psychologists studying higher education, we at the Center would be interested in this phenomenon.

After outlining the research upon which this presentation is based, I'll be describing the political and social positions of a group of students I call potential activists. I'll comment upon the role of psychologists in campus conflicts. Finally, after describing the way the potential activists see their education ideally, and how they see it at present, I'll comment on where these students are going.

While following students at three University of California campuses through their first two years, it was noted that freshmen who responded most favorably on an attitude question concerning a well publicized activist movement--specifically the Berkeley Free Speech Movement--were much like the demonstrators themselves when compared on a wide range of psychological scales.[3] This paper is the result of further examination of the attitudes of these students.

---

[1]Presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Psychological Association, San Francisco, September 1968.

[2]My thanks go to Drs. Ronald Mock and Paul Heist for their encouragement and helpful criticisms.

[3]On the Omnibus Personality Inventory. See Heist, Paul, "The Dynamics of Student Discontent and Protest" read at APA, September 1966, Mimeo, University of California.

ED024970
CG 003 030

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

It was no surprise that those students who differentiated themselves from their fellows by viewing this issue as the FSM activists did, also viewed differently other aspects of their own educational environment. How, in fact, do these students, presently college seniors, see their education? What would they like in their own schooling--we hear much about the clamour for decision-making powers, but what would they do with that power?

First, the details concerning the group under study: Originally, most of the entering freshmen in 1965 on the Davis, Los Angeles, and Santa Barbara campuses of the University of California were tested on academic ability and, through the Omnibus Personality Inventory, disposition toward intellectuality.[4] It should be noted that the campuses under study are not known for activism--they are not unlike a good many state institutions in that regard. Their more notorious cousins at Berkeley--the freshmen of the following year-- will be used in several comparisons.

The main sample described here consists of those students who, at the end of their freshman year, endorsed the two extreme categories of a five category attitudinal question,[5] namely those who were favorable and supportive of the Berkeley Free Speech Movement and participating students, and those who were very opposed and critical, plus a third group who were either neutral or had no opinions on the issue. The group of most interest to this researcher, the pro-FSMers, consisted of only 5 percent of those surveyed (see table 1).

---

[4]The Intellectual Disposition Categories are derived from scales on the Omnibus Personality Inventory. See Center for the Study of Higher Education, Omnibus Personality Inventory--research manual, Berkeley: University of California, Center for the Study of Higher Education, 1962.

[5]On the basis of the test scores, the original sample was surveyed with questionnaires in such a way as to underrepresent average students and over-represent those on the extremes of the two test variables. It should be noted, however, that the personality profiles of the surveyed group did not differ from that of the originally tested group.

However, this group most consistently held to its position through the sophomore year--less that 4 percent of the group moved more than one category away (see table 2). Also, by the sophomore year, 14 percent of the total of those surveyed were in the most favorable category. In the comparison Berkeley sample, 14 percent of the males and 21 percent of the females were very pro-FSM as freshmen.

Those very opposed students represented 20 percent of the freshmen surveyed at the three UC campuses, but only 10 percent by the sophomore year.[6] More than a quarter of the students who began as very opposed were at least neutral by their sophomore year. At Berkeley, 11 percent of the males and 7 percent of the females were against the movement as freshmen.

While the 5 percent group of very pro-FSMers cannot be called activists--our data are attitudinal rather than action based--surely it is from this small minority that one could expect the activists to emerge. The inclusion of the neutral group in the study was intended to result in a somewhat apolitical comparison group for the two extremes, representative of a sizable segment of the student body most of the time. Actually, variable after variable indicated that the neutrals tend to stand with the very opposed group. Of course, by the second year the tendency of students to become more liberal as they progress through college is reflected in the fact that almost half of the neutral group is at least somewhat favorable to the FSM. But for purposes of this report, based on the freshman attitudes, the situation is often one of only two distinct groups: the very pro-FSMers compared to the neutrals and very anti-FSM group.

Since the Free Speech Movement is by now part of history, and more recent activism makes it look rather tame, I'd like to describe some of the other

---

[6] Percentages for the other attitude categories the sophomore year were: somewhat opposed, 26%; neutral, 14%; somewhat favorable, 36%.

issues which separate the groups. The differences are consistent and lend support to our assumption that the groups described as anti-FSM and pro-FSM have political, social, and academic outlooks which differ, and that, in fact, as suggested by our earlier personality data and extensive background information (much of it supporting the findings of Richard Flacks), we have identified basically different types in the two extreme groups.

On issues closely tied to campus life, pro-FSMers exceed their peers in sympathy for and potential activism on issues concerning promotion of faculty on the basis of teaching, opposition to loyalty oaths, and greater student involvement in setting university policy.

On the last issue, the Berkeley sample lent support. The extent to which Berkeley freshmen--not sophisticated upperclassmen--would participate in movements concerned with promoting greater student involvement in setting campus policies is undoubtably a sign of the future (see table 3). Ninety-two percent of the pro-FSMers would be sympathetic to such a cause--35 percent of those would become active in such a movement--and a majority of even the most conservative would be sympathetic. It takes a good deal of courage or blindness to ignore feelings like that.

Increasingly, those psychologists involved with campus life will have to decide where they stand in this struggle, as more and more of the rest of the academic community turns to them for their expertise in matters of human behavior. There will be attempts to use that expertise to muffle the demands of the students, but one would hope that other tasks would be taken up instead: the task of helping administrators understand their vocal students; the task of building learning situations that are relevant to these students; the task of cooperating in the translation of angry demands--from both sides--into creative solutions.

Elaboration on the involvement of students in academic planning comes from the Berkeley group, where approximately two-thirds agreed that students should participate significantly in the content and organization of courses, academic policy decisions, and matters of this sort, and that students should be given very great freedom in choosing their own subjects of study and their own areas of interest within those subjects (see table 4). The Berkeley pro-FSMers also upheld academic freedom positions more so than their peers, including the right of controversial people to speak on campus, communists to teach, and faculty to be free from legislative political investigation.

In a time when tremendous pressures are exerted to stifle protests against an unpopular war, when government censorship is a very real string attached to research monies, we look to the universities to encourage the free exchange of ideas. It is very discouraging, then, to see that part of the university, namely, Berkeley freshmen, does not overwhelmingly support the free exchange of ideas. Exhibiting the freshman anti-intellectuality shown by the early Vassar research, only 14 percent of the anti-FSM group could strongly support a statement reading, "a person who advocated unpopular actions or holds unpopular ideas, no matter how extreme, should be allowed to speak to students on the college campus." For the neutrals the figure was only 22 percent.

The very goals in college which separate the groups in the main study of the three campuses suggests this difference in openness to new ideas: more pro-FSM students than their peers are interested in increasing their understanding of people with different backgrounds and values, in having the opportunity to be exposed to the best thinking of the ages, and of being challenged to critically reexamine basic beliefs (see table 5).

The personality test data concerning autonomy and independence of judgment suggested that the pro-FSMers had already attained a way of thinking which

reflects freedom and emancipation, and permits them to tangle with questions of philosophy and ethics.

Looking at issues of more concern to the wider community, the three campus pro-FSM group was also more likely to become involved with or to be sympathetic to movements on their campus concerning civil rights or opposition to the war (see table 6). Predictably, those favorable (34%) in the Berkeley sample were more likely than their Berkeley peers (6%) to describe an ideal college as one in which students were quite involved with off-campus politics rather than campus activities (chi square = 187.23, df = 4, $p < .01$).

Not surprisingly, the political label ascribed to oneself was closely related to FSM attitude. By the sophomore year, the trend through college to call oneself liberal had become more apparent so that differences between the attitudinal groups were less striking. That is, more of those who as freshmen were very opposed to the FSM or neutral are willing to describe themselves at least liberal if not radical by the time they are sophomores than were so willing as freshmen (see table 7).

This gives us an idea of who these potential activists are. What, then, would they do about their own educational setting if they had the power they seek? What kind of education do they want?

On the broad issues of day-to-day organization of life in the college environment, the potential activists are more likely than their peers to prefer a situation where they set their own tasks and are engaged in independent reading and writing, or where research papers are assigned, but the work is independent, where the classes are group discussion or seminars, and where there is informal access to staff (see table 8). Their anti-FSM peers, on the other hand, prefer the traditional classroom organization with assignments and regular examinations.

Turning to the specifics of their education, the groups being compared differ on the importance they place on various aspects of college. For instance, the potential activists generally place more importance than their peers on the process of gaining self-insight, on their own literary or artistic work, on the research they undertake, and on the interactions with their classmates through bull-sessions. They place less importance on parties and athletics. The Berkeley sample results paralleled those of the activists (see table 9).

The Berkeley sample offers an opportunity to examine what an ideal college would be according to the thinking of these students. The majority of the entire sample concurred in their description of an ideal college; however, proportionately more of the pro-FSMers endorsed the urban, residential, secular college away from home in which group discussions have a broad, general orientation, and in which there is little grade competition (see table 10). The majority of the sample, with no group differences, described their ideal college as a large public, coed campus on the quarter system, having no graduate schools and little snob appeal: essentially Berkeley with the much longed for attention to the undergraduates. The potential activists differentiated themselves from their peers in preferring an experimental program which de-emphasized fraternities and athletics, with a pass-fail grading system, and highly intelligent peers who were involved in off-campus politics. The majority in each group preferred selection by grades and admission scores, and a close-knit community, but a smaller majority of the pro-FSMers chose these traits.

In a situation where superior grades might be in conflict with expressing one's own ideas in a Berkeley classroom, the majority would choose to express themselves, but the pro-FSMers (89%) have a larger majority than their neutral (62%) and anti-FSM (65%) peers (chi square = 71.76, df = 2, $p < .01$).

Knowing a little about how these students think they would prefer their education, how do they assess their present educational situation? During their sophomore year on the three UC campuses, the potential activists were less Pollyanna-like in their descriptions of the campus. They were not as apt as the other groups to describe much diversity or tolerance for diversity, the presence of intellectual commitment or seriousness toward studies, or warmth from their peers (see table 11). The majority of the entire sample felt that grades were of much more concern than was learning; more than a third described much memory work involved in the courses, and only a quarter expressed satisfaction with the amount of privacy and quiet.

What becomes of these students? Do they remain at their campuses? Apparently the anti-FSM group is more likely to remain at one place, at least for the first two years. By the junior year, close to half of those favorable (49%) or neutral (45%) to FSM were no longer enrolled at the campuses in question, compared to only a third (34%) of those opposed (chi square = 9.4, df = 2, $p < .01$). It became apparent in earlier studies of activists, such as those involved in the Free Speech Movement, that moving from campus to campus was a way of life for some of them, so we can rest assured that many of the pro-FSMers who left Davis, UCLA, or Santa Barbara, are still to be reckoned with at one campus or another.

The personality data[7] typify the pro-FSMers as having the interests and general orientation of serious students and young scholars; already as freshmen they manifest the characteristics which will lead to graduate school and advanced degrees. In contrast, their anti-FSM peers are below the national averages on scales of intellectual orientation; many could be described as only fair bets for serious scholarship.

---

[7]Specifically, from the OPI scales of Thinking Introversion, Theoretical Orientation, Estheticism, and Complexity.

The educational plans of the potential activists are congruent with their interests on the intellective scales, so this group of students will probably be involved with campus life for some time to come (see table 12): almost three-quarters of them plan on earning a master's (30%) or a doctoral or professional degree (44%), compared to half of the opposed group (M.A. 22%; Ph.D., M.D., etc., 30%). In short, the halls of academia, including those that are the province of psychologists, will likely be feeling more pressure from the <u>inside</u> as these activism-prone students make their way through the advanced degrees and on to membership in that august body known as the APA.

Table 1

Attitudes of University of California Freshmen, Spring 1966, Toward the 1964 Berkeley Free Speech Movement and Participating Students, by Campus and Sex

Attitude	Davis		Los Angeles		Santa Barbara		Total
	M	F	M	F	M	F	
Very opposed and critical							
N	36	46	49	37	59	61	288
%	24	26	20	14	24	17	20
Somewhat opposed							
N	56	66	80	90	66	148	506
%	36	37	33	35	27	41	35
Neutral, no opinions or feelings							
N	17	23	42	53	40	80	255
%	11	13	17	21	16	22	18
Sympathetic and somewhat favorable							
N	34	32	57	61	59	58	301
%	22	18	23	24	24	16	21
Favorable and supportive							
N	9	11	15	14	18	12	79
%	6	6	6	5	7	3	5

Table 2

Sophomore Attitudes toward FSM for Three Freshmen Attitude Groups

Sophomore attitudes	Freshman FSM attitudes					
	Very-anti		Neutral		Very-pro	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Very-anti	78	35%	6	3%	1	2%
Some-anti	87	39	29	15	1	2
Neutral	19	8	63	33	0	0
Some-pro	32	14	80	42	12	21
Very-pro	9	4	12	7	43	75
Total	225[a]	100	190	100	57	100

[a]Differences in total from freshman data reflect difference in freshman and sophomore survey response rate.

Table 3

Percentages of UCB Freshmen, Spring 1967, Who Would Be Sympathetic[a] to Various Potential Issues, by FSM Attitude

Issues	Anti-FSM	Neutral	Pro-FSM
Greater student involvement in setting campus policies. $X^2 = 233.31^{**}$	58%	59%	92%
Opposition to dormitory regulations. $X^2 = 129.45^{**}$	25	37	65

[a]Includes being actively involved and contributing money.

**Significant at .01 level for eight degrees of freedom.

Table 4

Percentages of UCB Freshmen, Spring 1967, Who Endorsed Statements Concerned with Academic Freedom and Student Involvement in Academic Policy Decisions, by FSM Attitudes

Statements	Anti-FSM	Neutral	Pro-FSM
Agree that students should "participate significantly in the content and organization of courses, academic policy decisions, and matters of that sort." $X^2 = 122.46$**	32%	35%	68%
Agree that "students should be given very great freedom in choosing their subjects of study and in choosing their own areas of interest within those subjects." $X^2 = 25.94$**	44	50	65
Strongly agree that "a person who advocates upopular actions or holds unpopular ideas, no matter how extreme, should be allowed to speak to students on the college campus." $X^2 = 386.00$**	14	22	78
Strongly disagree that "present members of the Communist Party should not be allowed to teach in colleges and universities." $X^2 = 346.72$**	5	8	51
Strongly disagree that "legislative committees should investigate the political beliefs of university faculty members." $X^2 = 314.40$**	15	20	76

Note:--Underlined percentages are not significantly different.

**Significant at .01 level.

Table 5

Importance of Several College Goals Grouped By Attitudes

Toward the Free Speech Movement

Importance	Anti-FSM		Neutral		Pro-FSM	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
"Increase my understanding of people with backgrounds and/or values different from my own."*						
Very important	136	33%	150	59%	52	66
Somewhat important	98	38	71	28	21	27
Neutral	41	19	26	10	4	5
Unimportant	10	10	7	3	2	2
Total	285	100	254	100	79	100
"Have the opportunity to be exposed to the best thinking of the ages."*						
Very important	112	39	110	43	46	58
Somewhat important	125	44	95	38	27	34
Neutral	37	13	38	15	3	4
Unimportant	10	4	10	4	3	4
Total	284	100	253	100	79	100
"Be challenged to critically re-examine basic beliefs."**						
Very important	112	36	103	41	55	70
Somewhat important	91	32	85	33	16	20
Neutral	65	23	51	20	5	6
Unimportant	26	9	14	6	3	4
Total	294	100	253	100	79	100

*Significant at .05 level for six degrees of freedom.

**Significant at .01 level for six degrees of freedom.

Table 6

Responses of Freshmen at Three UC Campuses, Spring 1966, Concerning Roles They Would Take in Various Campus Protest Movements, by FSM Attitude, in Percentages

Topics	Anti-FSM			Neutral			Pro-FSM		
	Sympathetic	Neutral	Opposed	Sympathetic	Neutral	Opposed	Sympathetic	Neutral	Opposed
Civil rights	49%	39%	12%	71%	28%	1%	95%	5%	0%
Greater student involvement in setting university policy	35	49	16	50	49	1	82	16	2
Opposition to war in Viet Nam	4	14	82	23	40	37	75	16	9
Opposition to loyalty oath	10	31	59	14	66	20	75	24	3
Opposition to dorm regulations	32	42	26	42	45	13	65	30	5
Promote professors on basis of teaching skill	70	26	4	67	32	1	86	14	0

Note:--Category of sympathetic includes being actively involved and contributing funds.

Table 7

Freshmen and Sophomore Political Self-Descriptions of Three UC Campuses by Attitude toward the FSM as Freshmen, in Percentages

Politics	Freshman politics			Sophomore politics		
	Anti-FSM	Neutral	Pro-FSM	Anti-FSM	Neutral	Pro-FSM
Radical left, very liberal, or liberal	21%	40%	89%	30%	50%	89%
Moderate	34	46	10	31	36	9
Conservative, very conservative, or radical right	45	14	1	39	14	2

Table 8

Preferred Emphases[a] in College Education of UC Freshmen, by Attitude, in Percentages

Emphases	Anti-FSM	Neutral	Pro-FSM
Independent reading and writing; setting own tasks. $X^2 = 22.50^{**}$	22%	27%	54%
Class work, class assignments, regular examinations, etc. $X^2 = 18.45^{**}$	56	42	29
Research and preparation of reports on findings; work independent but tasks assigned. $X^2 = 10.43^{*}$	30	27	47
Small group discussions, seminars. $X^2 = 12.97^{*}$	34	31	54
Access to teachers, research personnel on a non-structured basis. $X^2 = 9.77^{*}$	40	36	50

[a]Would like a predominant amount (contrasted to a supplement or very little or none) of day to day school life organized around these.

*Significant at .05 level for four degrees of freedom.

**Significant at .01 level for four degrees of freedom.

Table 9

Importance of College Activities for University of California Freshmen, by FSM Attitude, in Percentages

Activities	Very Important,[a] Important[b]			Unimportant		
	Anti-FSM	Neutral	Pro-FSM	Anti-FSM	Neutral	Pro-FSM
Self-discovery, self-insight						
UCD, UCLA, UCSB[a] $X^2 = 36.49^{**}$	63%	74%	81%	5%	3%	2%
UCB[b] $X^2 = 50.62^{**}$	65	70	88	6	4	1
Individual study and research						
UCD, UCLA, UCSB $X^2 = 15.40^{*}$	40	35	55	5	9	4
UCB $X^2 = 28.83^{**}$	60	55	71	7	3	2
Individual artistic or literary work						
UCD, UCLA, UCSB $X^2 = 55.95^{**}$	13	16	47	34	27	13
UCB $X^2 = 80.26^{**}$	25	38	37	50	36	14
"Bull-sessions" with fellow students						
UCD, UCLA, UCSB $X^2 = 84.69^{**}$	23	22	38	8	11	10
UCB $X^2 = 52.08^{**}$	44	36	63	12	11	5
Getting acquainted with the faculty						
UCD, UCLA, UCSB $X^2 = 12.96^{*}$	13	9	14	19	14	14
UCB $X^2 = 13.91^{**}$	44	40	53	8	7	8
Parties and social life						
UCD, UCLA, UCSB $X^2 = 15.22^{*}$	19	15	9	9	10	21
UCB $X^2 = 10.28^{*}$	30	24	26	16	12	20
Athletics						
UCD, UCLA, UCSB $X^2 = 40.23^{**}$	14	8	4	28	35	58
UCB $X^2 = 89.62^{**}$	34	20	8	24	32	55

*Significant at .05 level for 6 degrees of freedom in UCD, UCLA, UCSB, and 4 degrees of freedom in UCB sample.

**Significant at .01 level for 6 degrees of freedom in UCD, UCLA, UCSB, and 4 degrees of freedom in UCB sample.

Table 10

Characteristics Chosen by UCB Freshmen to Describe Their Ideal College, by FSM Attitude, in Percentages

Characteristics chosen	Anti-FSM	Neutral	Pro-FSM
Secular over church affiliated. $X^2 = 29.44^{**}$	86%	90%	98%
Urban over rural. $X^2 = 22.98^{**}$	85	86	96
Residential over commuter. $X^2 = 27.35^{**}$	81	87	95
Broad, general emphasis over specialization. $X^2 = 27.62^{**}$	73	70	86
Group discussion over lecture. $X^2 = 42.55^{**}$	66	62	84
Away over close to home. $X^2 = 14.51^{**}$	57	68	85
Little over much competition for grades and recognition. $X^2 = 33.84^{**}$	55	53	74
Most highly intelligent over wide range of intelligence. $X^2 = 31.46^{**}$	44	45	64
Pass-fail over letter grades. $X^2 = 85.74^{**}$	36	44	73
Selection by grades and admission scores over personal qualities. $X^2 = 27.44^{**}$	72	75	56
Athletics not emphasized over "big time" intercollegiate athletics. $X^2 = 93.68^{**}$	21	31	60
Quite involved with off-campus politics over main concern with campus activities. $X^2 = 261.68^{**}$	16	37	84
Experimental over traditional. $X^2 = 187.22^{**}$	22	38	79
No fraternities and sororities. $X^2 = 96.71^{**}$	24	37	65
Community close-knit over impersonal. $X^2 = 7.69^{*}$	75	72	65

Note:--Groups connected by underlining are not significantly different.

*Significant at .05 level for two degrees of freedom.

**Significant at .01 level for two degrees of freedom.

Table 11

Descriptions of Their Campus Environments by Sophomores at UC Davis, Los Angeles, and Santa Barbara, Spring 1967, by Attitude toward FSM, in Percentages

Descriptions	Anti-FSM	Neutral	Pro-FSM
There is much[a] tolerance for divergent views, dress, behavior. $X^2 = 27.37^{**}$	56%	61%	27%
Study is much more important than socializing. $X^2 = 33.35^{**}$	35	14	4
There is much intellectual commitment among the students. $X^2 = 22.18^{**}$	22	15	7
There is much diversity in student views, backgrounds, etc. $X^2 = 26.50^{**}$	53	44	21
Much seriousness is shown toward studies. $X^2 = 25.73^{**}$	38	27	10
Much warmth and friendliness is shown by students. $X^2 = 20.68^{**}$	48	33	23

Note:--Groups connected by underlining are not significantly different.

[a]Other choices were some, and little or no.

**Significant at .01 level for four degrees of freedom.

3801 S TOD

Table 12

Final Level of Education Expected by University of California Freshmen, Spring 1966, Grouped According to Attitudes toward the Berkeley Free Speech Movement

Educational level	Anti-FSM		Neutral		Pro-FSM	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Less than bachelor's degree	8	3	1	1	0	0
Bachelor's degree or teaching credential	121	45	113	52	17	26
Master's degree	60	22	44	20	19	30
Doctoral or professional degree	79	30	58	27	28	44
Total	268	100	216	100	64	100

Note:-- Chi square 26.34 was significant at .01 level for six degrees of freedom.